


PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-P

PC-P1



I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.

Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center





Name (First and Last): <u>Alfredo Pacheco</u>	
Organization: <u>Labor Local 652</u>	
Address (Optional): <u>1919 E Syracuse St. #127 Anaheim Ca 92805</u>	
Phone Number: <u>714 780-0057</u>	Email address:

Comments: Traffic is increase


This Project would create jobs an Revenue for the city an county

it will also help our infrastructure of the bridges an streets

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

PC-P2



I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.

Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):





☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <u>Ly Pachillo</u>	
Organization: <u>L.A. County Superior</u>	
Address (Optional):	
Phone Number:	Email address:


Comments: Road repairs are always with tax payers money for

Capital same, 9. Safety on roads

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

PC-P3



I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.





Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <u>JOHNNY PALMERIN</u>	
Organization: <u>LABORER 652</u>	
Address (Optional): <u>1425 DEPRAD ST.</u>	
Phone Number: <u>951) 210-2358</u>	Email address: <u>JOHNNY.PALMERIN@AOL.COM</u>

Comments: EMPLOYMENT IN THE CONSTRUCTION
TRADE IS AT AN ALL TIME LOW,
ANOTHER REASON, THIS PROJECT WOULD CREATE
JOBS AND REVENUE FOR THE CITY AND
COUNTY, BY 2040 ORANGE COUNTY WILL ADD
370 THOUSAND NEW RESIDENTS WHICH WILL
INCREASE THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION,

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

PC-P4

Bruce Panting
4188 Banyan Avenue
Seal Beach, California 90740

July 15, 2012

Attn: Ms. Smita Deshpande
Branch Chief – CalTrans District 12
405 DEIR/DEIS Comment Period
2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92612

Re: San Diego Freeway (I-405) Improvement Project SR-73 to I-605:

I would like to start off by introducing myself. My name is Bruce Panting and I live in College Park East located in Seal Beach with my wife Nancy and two sons Christopher and Sean. We moved here to our home in 2006 for a variety of reasons the most important ones being a better quality of life for my family, a safe place to live, and one of the best education systems around. As you read on please understand that my passion along with my neighbors to look out for our neighborhood stems from many years of hard work to give our families the best we can give. As far as my direct association to the freeway, our home is located approximately 100 yards from the current sound wall with Almond Avenue being the only way we can get to our home. I personally work in Costa Mesa and use the 405 Freeway from Seal Beach Boulevard to Bristol Avenue on a daily basis. To be clear I am not in favor of any of the freeway expansion alternatives and would like the Orange County Transit Authority to present a No Build alternative to Cal Trans. If the Orange County Transit Authority does move forward with this project I have a list of questions that I would like you to address.

1. Trees, plants, and vegetation are a critical part of our ecosystem. Currently the 405 Freeway is lined with thousands of trees and bushes consisting of but not limited to Eucalyptus trees Crepe Myrtle, Ice plant ground cover, and various wall climbing plants. With the lost of this vegetation due to the widening of the freeway what will be put in place to replace the environmental, aesthetical, and acoustical benefits these plants currently give?

2. Specifically in our neighborhood two of the proposed build alternatives necessitate the removal and rebuild of the existing sound walls. I would like the following issues addressed.

a. Currently the sound wall along Almond Avenue is at a height of 18 feet. In the Environmental Impact Report it states that the highest wall Cal Trans will build is 16 feet. At the various community meetings it was stated that existing sound walls will be replaced with like sound walls. What assurances do we have that the new walls will

PC-P4 Continued

● Page 2


July 15, 2012

- be built to the same height as the ones existing? Saying a wall will be replaced with a "like" wall can imply that it is the same in one aspect but not in another. } 3
- b. College Park East is a neighborhood with underground utilities. Even our streetlights are free of overhead wires. If the sound walls are moved will the existing utilities that are along the sound walls be placed under ground? Moving the utilities to the North side of Almond Avenue above ground is completely unacceptable. } 4
- c. In the EIR report it indicates the sound wall that affects us is wall S1142 and if replaced to "Replace in-kind". What exactly is replace in-kind? I did not see any assembly drawing of the existing wall. Can you make that information available to us? } 5
- d. If the wall is taken down and relocated what steps will be taken to provide safety, security, and sound abatement until the new walls are in place? } 6
3. At the OCTA own admission (see attached news article) the toll roads are not generating the revenue as expected. If measure M money is not being used to pay for the express lane is OCTA reevaluating the idea of the toll road or are they looking to adjust the construction budget? } 7
4. With only four General Purpose lanes and one Car Pool lane in both directions of the 405 freeway West of the 605 freeway and with no plans for the widening of the freeway from that point common sense will tell you any number on lanes added to the 405 freeway East of the 605 will just cause an extreme bottle neck. With all the additional lanes of car sitting idle what air degradation are we going to expect? } 8
5. Since this study is most likely public information will we have access to all of the letters submitted to the Orange County Transit Authority? Will the public be able to see whose is in favor and against this project? } 9
6. The state of California is swimming in dept, cities are filing for bankruptcy, and the government is hedging their bet that the people will pass a tax increase that most likely will fail due to the fact that people are tired of the government's extravagant and reckless spending. How in anyone's right mind can the state think it would be a sound idea to spend this or any money on a project we cannot afford? Saying we have money earmarked for this project is like the Las Vegas panhandler asking for money for food even though his pocket is full of money for gambling. If your response is this will help the economy with a make work project then spend } 10

PC-P4 Continued

● Page 3

July 15, 2012

- the money by keeping our teachers working and educate our future so they can come up with a better solution to the traffic problem than the one presented here. } 10
- I feel strongly that this project will be a detriment to the health and well being of our neighborhood. With the increased traffic during and after the construction, the five years of night time construction operation, and the unsafe situation the altered sound wall will bring. Is the Orange County Transit Authority, Cal Trans, and the State of California willing to take on the dire consequences this project will bring? } 11
- Sincerely,
- 
- Bruce Panting
4188 Banyan Avenue
Seal Beach, CA 90740
H 562 598-8782
C 562 889-1208
- Cc
City of Seal Beach, CA
Gary A. Miller - Mayor Pro Tem
211 8th Street
Seal Beach, California 90740

PC-P4 Continued

O.C. tollways to stop taking cash

Booth attendant jobs will be cut and prices raised to bolster the system's finances.

BY MIKE REICHER

Operators of Orange County's toll road network are planning to eliminate cash payments and toll-booth jobs as they try to squeeze more out of their financially strapped pay-to-drive highways.

Drivers who use the route 73, 261, 241 and 133 toll roads will need to have payment accounts linked to their transponders or their license plates in order to use the corridors. Cash payments will be phased out over the next 16 months.

The FasTrak transponders and license-plate accounts electronically deduct money from a driver's credit line.

In addition, a rate hike takes effect Sunday. Cash tolls will increase 25 to 50 cents at most toll plazas and FasTrak tolls will increase 5% to 10%. Rates vary depending on the time of day.



RIDERSHIP on O.C. toll roads is lower than projected, causing operators to seek ways to save money.

The changes, which will eliminate about 100 toll-booth jobs, come about a year after the 73 toll road project restructured its roughly \$2.1 billion in debt. An agreement with bondholders requires the agency to raise tolls whenever feasible.

As ridership continues to fall below projections, leaders are looking for long-term money-saving measures.

Without tollbooths, even casual users will have to register beforehand or else pay a fine for using the public

road. Cameras will capture license plate numbers, and motorists who have set up pre-paid accounts registered to the photographed number will be billed.

FasTrak customers will still be able to use their transponders, according to the Transportation Corridor Agencies website.

Drivers who use the toll roads but have not registered their license plate numbers will receive a violation unless they pay the toll online within 48 hours, said Lori Olin, a spokeswoman

for the Transportation Corridor Agencies, which oversees the entire network of tollways.

The fine is currently \$57.50, plus the toll amount.

"There's going to be a much broader opportunity for people to pay for the use of the toll road without having to slow down and pull cash out of their pocket," said Newport Beach City Councilman Rush Hill, chairman of the San Joaquin Hills Transportation Corridor Agency Board of Directors.

The TCA contractor that staffs the county's tollbooths, Central Parking Systems, has 81 attendants throughout the county. The TCA directly employs 12 toll-booth workers, according to Olin. Those 12 cash handlers will receive severance pay.

The San Joaquin Hills agency has increased toll rates 12 times since fiscal year 1997, according to the bond-rating company Fitch, making its per-mile toll rate one of the highest in comparison with similar toll roads. Its last rate hike was in July 2011.

mike.reicher@latimes.com

PC-P5

Smita Deshpande, Branch Chief,
Caltrans-District 12, "Attn: 405 DEIR-DEIS Comment Period"
2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA, 92612

Subject: State Route 405 (I-405; San Diego Freeway) between SR-73 and I-605 and Draft EIR/EIS

I am concerned about the impacts the State Route 405 improvement project will have on our community. I am especially concerned about Alternative 3 which will widen the San Diego Freeway in the City of Costa Mesa and convert an existing car pool lane to a toll lane.

Alternative 3 would require that the Fairview/I 405 interchange be demolished and rebuilt, even though it was just rebuilt three years ago. Residences and public parks near the I-405 will be adversely affected both during construction and upon completion of the project. Problems include air pollution, noise, and degradation of the visual quality of our neighborhoods. Ramp closures at Harbor, Fairview, and South Coast will not only inconvenience residents, but impair access to the many businesses which contribute to our local and regional economy.

In addition,

Please include these comments in the public/administrative record for this project and the project EIR/EIS. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Yours truly,

Christopher L. Parker
(Name)

1872 Monrovia Ave B-4 Costa Mesa CA 92627
(Address) (City)

☒ Please keep me informed about future hearings and future steps in the review process for the I-405 project.

PC-P6

July 12, 2012

Ms. Smita Deshpande, Branch Chief – CalTrans District 12
Attn: 405 DEIR/DEIS Comment Period,
2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200,
Irvine, CA 92612

Dear Ms. Deshpande,

I am a resident of College Park East in Seal Beach. Although I would prefer not to have any freeway lanes added and instead to begin a light rail system as Los Angeles County has to get people out of their cars, I recognize that this won't happen at this time. My main concern now is to protect the sound wall and the narrowing of Almond Avenue. Also, I understand that there is a possibility that the gas/petroleum lines will need to be relocated that could cause problems for CPE.

I am concerned, too, about greater health risks due to increased vehicle emissions, more traffic gridlock at the county line and devaluing of my property. I know that you are aware of the other concerns expressed by CPE residents, especially if alternatives 2 and 3 are implemented.

Therefore, I request that CalTrans 1, only add one general purpose lane in each direction and not move the sound wall, or 2, end the 405 Improvement Project at Valley View Street and use the existing seven lanes of 405 between Valley View Street and the Los Angeles County line in any manner desired for the optimum traffic flow, or 3, another alternative so the soundwall would not need to be moved.

Sincerely,



Barbara Parks
4240 Birchwood Ave.
Seal Beach, CA 90740

PC-P7

From: Joe Partise [joepartise@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 4:59 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: EIR Questions

This is my Public Comment concerning the proposed expansion of the I405 between SR73 and I605.

My name is Joe Partise. I live at 3540 Fern Circle in the area known as College Park East in Seal Beach. My cul-de-sac intersects with Almond Ave. which under Alternative 2 & 3 proposes to move (which means destroy and replace) our Freeway wall and narrow Almond ave. by up to 8-10 feet.

Here are my questions and issues

1. How are we supposed to deal with the loss of parking on Almond? Twice a month we are unable to park on the street due to sweeping. When driveways are not available, we rely on Almond for parking. When we have several guests, they rely on parking on Almond.
2. How will you deal with the loss of safety for pedestrians and cyclists? They are already in close proximity to my vehicle at the current width.
3. Are you prepared to be responsible for accidents, injuries and perhaps deaths that could occur by the narrowing of this street?
4. Is it true that gas lines may have to be relocated from the South side of the freeway into our neighborhood?
5. Is it true that overhead electrical lines may be relocated on Almond, as well? right now, all of our electrical lines are underground.
6. How will homeowners be compensated for further reductions in the value of their homes? We already suffer from reduced appraisals because of proximity to the freeway. The entire neighborhood will be affected due to comp appraisals. Homes close to the freeway take much longer to sell and could be virtually impossible to sell during the construction phase.
7. How can we possibly be compensated for the increased noise and pollution?
8. OCTA officials say that they will replace the wall with one of comparable size and construction. I'm not much for vague promises. What is your proposal for the replacement wall?

Construction phase issues

1. Do you really expect the homeowners to tolerate the destruction of our wall while you expand the freeway?
2. How do you propose to mitigate the noise and pollution?
3. Prior to the original wall, burglaries were common with motorists parking their cars on the side of the freeway and entering the neighborhood. Crimes were committed and a fast getaway was available. How do you propose to protect the neighborhood for increased exposure to criminal activity?
4. How many months (or years) do you expect to leave us with a wall during construction?
5. Do you intend to stage construction activities on Almond (especially if utilities are moved)? How do you expect residents to access their homes during these times.

Coordination with L.A. County

1. Have you given any consideration to the gridlock you will create when the 405 reached the L.A. County line? Do you really care about this impact?
2. Has there been any attempt to coordinate efforts with L.A. County?
3. Do you have any idea how far south on the 405 freeway the gridlock will extend.
4. What would be the measurement of increased pollution why the cars are gridlocked next to our neighborhood?
5. Why is this not considered in the EIR?
6. Can we assume you've given no consideration for the increased health risks to residents.

Seal Beach Blvd. NB onramp and sidestreets

1. Leisure World is right down the street. Do you really want these (and other Seal Beach Residents) to have to navigate 4 lanes in a short distance to prevent being thrown onto the 7th St. Bridge or 605 North?

PC-P7 Continued

2. Have you given any consideration about the drivers who will use Lampson Ave. and Seal Beach Blvd. as a method of bypassing the additional gridlock you propose to create?

Toll express Lanes

1. You are well aware that the voters are not in favor of "toll lanes".
2. Are you aware that a lane that requires 3 or more will force more cars into the general purpose lane?
3. Are you aware that they are only available to drivers who can afford them?
4. Are you aware that this defeats the entire purpose of this "improvement" project?

I would appreciate a prompt response to my questions. Thank you.

Joe Partise
3540 Fern Circle
Seal Beach, CA 90740

18

19

20

21

22

PC-P8

July 15, 2012

Ms. Smita Deshpande
Caltrans District 12
2201 Dupont Dr., Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92612

Dear Ms. Smita Deshpande:

I am a resident of the College Park East neighborhood in Seal Beach, California. I am writing to request that you consider NOT adding extra lanes to the 405 freeway. There will forever be more cars and more people wanting to use the existing freeway and, I believe, you cannot just keep adding lanes whenever the roads get too crowded. Eventually, people will drive at different times, carpool and/or take different routes.

The plans I have seen for widening the freeway will be detrimental to my neighborhood and to the residents who live there. Two of the plans include narrowing the road nearest to the freeway and moving the sound wall. The freeway is already too close to these houses and moving it closer, in addition to creating health hazards and construction dangers, will affect the property values of these homes and, indeed, all the homes in College Park East.

The benefits to be gained by adding lanes in Orange County will not be realized as long as Los Angeles County has no plans to widen their portion of the 405. You will simply be creating a bottleneck in a different location. In addition, the freeway entrance at Seal Beach Blvd is already a dangerous one for those who wish to continue on the 405 north. We must cross over 3 lanes very quickly to get into the correct lane. If another lane is added – I foresee more accidents and close calls at this dangerous on-ramp.

In addition, I firmly oppose the option of making one of these proposed lanes a toll lane as this completely negates the potential benefits of adding lanes. Not all drivers would have access to this new lane and traffic would not be alleviated.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter,



Allison Passanisi

1

2

3

4

5

PC-P10

Vincent Passanisi

(Space for comments continued on reverse)



PC-P11

From: Steve, Cary & Avery Pawlacyk [thepawlacyks@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 01, 2012 1:44 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: Do NOT move the Almond Ave sound wall!

To Whom it May Concern,

As residents of College Park East for the past 22 years, we are very concerned with the fact that there is a plan to move the Almond Ave sound wall. The sound wall not only protects us from freeway noise, it allows an ample area between the freeway and homes. The freeway is already one of the widest in the nation, one or two extra lanes will not help the mess. How will extra lanes help with the bottleneck on the 405? Will this lane make less accidents occur or will it make more accidents occur because of the extra room for bottlenecks? It is bad enough that we live in such close proximity to the freeway. We also would have to live with the sound wall being down and all of the dirt, dust, and pollution will be flowing throughout our neighborhood until it is completed. Will it help my asthma from becoming worse? This will also not help the aesthetics of the wall as the growth of the ivy has filled in over the years and will have to start all over again, if it all, leaving us with a big ugly cement wall. Will it maintain the home prices as they are or will it make them drop further?

Please take these words into consideration and please do **NOT** remove the sound wall on Almond. Leave it as it is and finish the freeway accordingly!

Sincerely,
 Cary and Steve Pawlacyk
 4881 Fir Avenue
 Seal Beach, CA 90740

PC-P12



I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.

Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

- ☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <u>Mark Payne</u>	
Organization: <u>Kabar Local 652</u>	
Address (Optional): <u>10704 Cedar Cir Fountain Valley</u>	
Phone Number: <u>714-349-9842</u>	Email address: _____

Comments: do to even crowding
in the south land, all freeway
will need to be expanded to
handle more traffic I.E. more people.

(Space for comments continued on reverse)



PC-P13

From: Sean Payne [seanpaynecfp@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 9:35 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Cc: Amy Payne
Subject: Comments on I-405 Improvement Project EIR/EIS






To Whom It May Concern,

My family and I have lived in the College Park East neighborhood for 4 years. One of the reasons that we moved to this area was the convenience of the three local freeways- 405, 22, and 605. We were also aware of the construction project that was slated to begin near the time that we moved in. Another reason that we moved to this neighborhood was that it is a safe, friendly neighborhood with a couple of parks. As we were looking at homes here, the one we found was located across from Almond Park. We liked the idea that we would have a park within a few steps of our home (we love on Oleander St.) that we could enjoy as we raised our family. We recognized that the freeway sits on the other side of the soundwall, but were happy with the location. Our main entry and exit from our neighborhood is Almond Ave. My office is in Seal Beach, so I enjoy a short commute across the freeway toward downtown. I understand and expect the congestion of the current project. Our concern is with two of the alternatives in the new project. The encroachment of the freeway expansion by two of the alternatives into our neighborhood would negatively effect our family- our park, our entry/exit in the neighborhood, and our home value. I am concerned about the construction process during which the soundwall would be torn down (this would be a huge safety issue), the effect on our park, and the driving/parking on Almond Ave. I am also concerned about the traffic congestion that would be created by a wide 405 freeway heading north hitting a much narrower 405/605 at the LA boarder. This is seen on the 5 north entering LA county. We also want to avoid a similar mess as the "22 crush." We oppose any expansion that would effect the location of the sound wall and/or any direct impact to our community.


Sincerely,
The Payne Family

--
Sean Payne
SeanPayneCFP@gmail.com

PC-P14

 <h2 style="margin: 0;">I-405 Improvement Project</h2> <h3 style="margin: 0;">Public Hearing</h3> <h3 style="margin: 0;">Comment Sheet</h3>	
<p>Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.</p>	
<p>Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):</p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium <input type="checkbox"/> Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center <input type="checkbox"/> Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center </p>	
<p>Name (First and Last): <u>Greg Bearman</u></p> <p>Organization: <u>Iron workers</u></p> <p>Address (Optional): <u>9626 minero rd Pinon Hills, ca 92371</u></p> <p>Phone Number: <u>608 868-4167</u> Email address: <u>gregbearman@yahoo.com</u></p>	
<p>Comments: <u>It will save gas and time.</u> <u>more time to spend with my family</u> <u>keep family's to have food on their</u> <u>plate.</u></p>	
<p>(Space for comments continued on reverse)</p>	
   	

PC-P15



I-405 Improvement Project

Public Hearing

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.





Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☒ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center


Name (First and Last): <u>Scott Pearson</u>	
Organization: <u>Plumbers Local 78</u>	
Address (Optional):	
Phone Number: <u>714-280-1381</u>	Email address:

Comments: this would help the commute
to & from work

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

PC-P16



I-405 Improvement Project

Public Hearing

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.





Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <u>JESS PEDROZA</u>	
Organization:	
Address (Optional):	
Phone Number: <u>(714) 230-5889</u>	Email address:


Comments: Living in Southern California has become over
crowded. With more people entering every day, it
necessary to wide & improve our street & highway.
So Cal will double its population in 10 yrs. It
is time to address our needs, thank you.

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

PC-P17

PC-P18



I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.





Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):


☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <u>Gilberto Pena</u>	
Organization: _____	
Address (Optional): <u>7912 Sauterne Dr. Rancho Cucamonga CA 91730</u>	
Phone Number: <u>(909) 209-0094</u>	Email address: _____

Comments: Better Roads and Safety Driving

(Space for comments continued on reverse)



I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.





Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <u>Cynthia Perez</u>	
Organization: _____	
Address (Optional): <u>10484 Parakeet Circle Fountain Valley CA 92705</u>	
Phone Number: <u>714-805-5599</u>	Email address: _____

Comments: Please give more Road work, yes to more
TOLL LANES

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

PC-P19

On Jun 6, 2012, at 1:58 AM, "Freddy Perez" <freddyperez2011@yahoo.com> wrote:






I have taken the time to hear the comments about the proposed HOT lanes and i do not believe it is a good idea. No on alternative #3. Let's play fair and look at other alternatives with OCTA!

Freddy Perez
Concerned Costa Mesian

Sent from my iPhone

} 1

PC-P20

 I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet	
Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.	
Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College	<input type="checkbox"/> Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
<input type="checkbox"/> Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center	<input type="checkbox"/> Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center
Name (First and Last): <u>Jose Luis Lopez</u>	
Organization: <u>Laborens Local 657</u>	
Address (Optional): <u>825 S Bitch ST Santa Ana CA</u>	
Phone Number: <u>714 625 4165</u>	Email address: _____
Comments: <u>Por que el Friwer Tiene mucho Trafico</u> <u>y accidentes y se ne se si ta mas Travado</u> <u>Para Los Lehbors</u>	
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____	
(Space for comments continued on reverse)	
   	

} 1

PC-P20 Translation

Because there is a lot of traffic and a lot of accidents in the freeway and more work is needed for the workers.

1

PC-P23

From: Roger Perkins [rogerwilcoperkins@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2012 7:58 AM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: 405 comment

Instead of widening the 405, please consider relieving some choke points, such as the 57 south transition to the west 91, that onramp backs up the whole west 91, please extend that onramp from the 57 to the Harbor/Lemon exit.

1

Thanks.

PC-P21

From: Jim Perham [jimperham@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 4:34 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: I-405 improvement project

Please, NO TOLL ROAD option.

1

Jim Perham
Los Alamitos

PC-P24

From: Tracy Pham [mailto:tracy@lexor.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 1:12 PM
To: Christina Byrne
Cc: dlcarey2@verizon.net
Subject: Business Input Regarding I-405 Expansion Project

Dear Ms Byrne,

As a community member, concerned business owner, board of directors for the Vietnamese American Chamber of Commerce, and resident of Orange County for over 26 years, I am writing to let you know that I agree with all of the requests put forth by the City of Westminster. I also vote against alternative 3 for this project because I feel that it will not help the flow of traffic but instead will create limited access. I have never used the toll roads on the 91 fwy because I feel like its not worth the cost and so I wouldn't use it on the 405 either. Therefore, this will only be a waste of space if it's not being utilized.

1

Thank you for listening to my concerns and I hope OCTA and Caltrans will consider the requests of the community.

Best Regards,

Tracy Pham
Human Resources Manager
Direct: (714) 522-1619
Fax: (714) 444-4095

Lexor Inc.
14800 Goldenwest St
Westminster, CA 926843
www.lexor.com

PC-P22

From: Roger Perkins [rogerwilcoperkins@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 24, 2012 10:55 AM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: 405 project comment

Hello, please consider not widening the 405 freeway in OC, I drive this route occasionally and the traffic flow seems fine most of the time, even during rush hour. However if you do decide to go ahead with the project please consider a combination of toll lane and bus lane compete with pedestrian access in the center of the freeway. A toll lane is ideal since the speed can be regulated by the amount of the toll and vise versa. A toll lane combined with a bus lane is also ideal since the buses will be able to schedule the stops accurately because of the uniform speed of the toll lane. A bus lane is very important as there are no commuter trains that go directly from Orange County to the south bay area cities such as Long Beach and Torrance. I would love to be able to drive to a bus station then take a bus that would travel at a good speed on the 405 to the downtown Long Beach bus plaza near where I work.

1

Thank You

Roger

PC-P25

PC-P26

I-405 Improvement Project
Public Hearing
Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.





Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): Tino Piam
 Organization: LOCAL UNION 582
 Address (Optional): P.O. BOX 2301 GARDEN GROVE CA 92842
 Phone Number: 714-815-7542 Email address: N/A

Comments: IT WILL HELP THE FREEWAY FLOW BETTER. IT WILL
ALSO MAKE THE COMMUTE BETTER FOR EVERYONE.

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

From: Tony Lori [mailto:tonylori03@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 9:31 AM
To: Christina Byrne
Subject: 405 Submissions

To whom it may concern,

I am totally against the proposal of toll lanes on the 405 for two major reasons.

First, the 91 toll lanes show that people can not afford to pay the ridiculous prices for the toll roads and the freeway still has congestion. The 91 has two toll lanes on each side and the 91 is still a bottleneck. It doesn't work!!! Add two extra lanes in both directions and it will alleviate congestion.

Second, we the taxpayers have been paying taxes and there is Measures that have been approved for these type of programs to expand and repair roads. We should not have to pay more to drive on them.


One last note, we should do away with the fancy brick work and designs on the sound walls. Drivers should be looking at the road and not at the walls, so who cares what art or brick designs are on the wall. Also it is not worth the cost especially when you cover them up with growing ivy like on the 22FWY expansion. Money could be used in better ways and road repairs.

Thanks for listening.

Tony Phillips
 tonylori03@hotmail.com

PC-P27

PC-P28



I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.





Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <u>Cody Pieplow</u>	
Organization: <u>Local Union 582</u>	
Address (Optional): <u>162 East 230th Street Carson CA 90745</u>	
Phone Number: <u>(424) 477-7530</u>	Email address: <u>codypieplow@gmail.com</u>

Comments: There won't be as much traffic as before
and hopefully you can get where your going
a bit faster.

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

From: Muriel Pike [murielpike@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2012 4:56 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing

To whom it may concern:
 I was present for the June 4th Public Hearing at Orange Coast College in Costa Mesa.
 Thanks for the informative presentation and detailed planning.
 I'm not convinced that the project would bring new benefits to Costa Mesa.
 I'm wondering who will make the final decision on the proposed alternatives?
 As for my personal opinion, I am fine with No Build or if necessary, Alt. 1


Muriel Pike
 3074 Warren Lane
 C.M. 92626

1

1

PC-P29

PC-P29 Continued

 **I-405 Improvement Project
Public Hearing
Comment Sheet**

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.





Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): Eduardo H. Pinuela
 Organization: Local 652 Laborers
 Address (Optional): 723 N. Hawthorn St. Anaheim
 Phone Number: 714-585-0737 Email address: _____

Comments: I think its a good idea because
it will reduce traffic going to work
and coming back home from work.
It will also help people spend
more time with there families.
It will also help create jobs for
the construction workers that
are finished with there unemployman
and have no other income to

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

Support there families.

Please use another sheet if you need more space for your comments.

To submit completed comment sheets, please return to staff member, place in the comment box or mail by July 2, 2012 to:
 Ms. Smita Deshpande
 Branch Chief – Caltrans District 12
 "Attn: 405 DEIR-DEIS Comment Period"
 2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200
 Irvine, CA 92612

For more information on the I-405 Improvement Project, please contact:
 Christina Byrne, Outreach Manager
 (714) 560-5717
www.octa.net/405improvement
www.facebook.com/405improvement

Responses may also be emailed to:
405dedcomments.parsons@parsons.com

PC-P30

From: HONESHOP@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 10:14 AM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: 605s to 405s at 5 p.m.

605s to 405s at 5 p.m. is still an issue as well as 405s to 22e

} 1

ROBERT PIRILLO, CEO
ROBERT'S HONING & GUNDRILLING INC.
12805 SUNSHINE AVENUE
SANTA FE SPRINGS, CA. 90670
PH. 562-777-2480, FAX 562-777-2490
WWW.ROBERTSHONING.COM

PC-P31



I-405 Improvement Project
Public Hearing

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.

Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

- ☒ Monday, June 4, 2012 - Orange Coast Community College ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 - Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 - Westminster Community Center ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 - Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <u>John Ploski</u>	
Organization:	
Address (Optional):	
Phone Number:	Email address:

Comments: As a lifelong resident of Costa Mesa
I strongly oppose Alternative 3 which would
add toll lanes. As a homeowner with a home
backed up to the Fairview Rd / 405 Freeway we
have had 3 major widening projects in our
backyard over the years when Fairview Road
was widened plus the recent Fairview bridge
construction. Each time there was extensive
noise, vibrations to our home, dust & traffic

} 1

(Space for comments continued on reverse)



PC-P31 Continued

Issues. Fairview Road is within a few feet of our back yard which has already reduced our property value so to have to endure years of bridge construction would further reduce property values or make selling of homes in the construction area difficult.

We don't need toll roads. Residents of Costa Mesa wouldn't even be able to access these lanes.

1

Please use another sheet if you need more space for your comments.

To submit completed response sheets, please return to staff member, place in the comment box or mail by July 2, 2012 to:

Ms. Smita Deshpande
Branch Chief - Caltrans District 12
"Attn: 405 DEIR-DEIS Comment Period"
2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92612

Responses may also be emailed to:
405.deircomments.parsons@parsons.com

For more information on the I-405 Improvement Project, please contact:
Christina Byrne, Outreach Manager
(714) 560-5717
www.octa.net/405Improvement
www.facebook.com/405Improvement

PC-P32



I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.

Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

- ☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 - Orange Coast Community College ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 - Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 - Westminster Community Center ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 - Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <u>Antonio Ponce</u>	
Organization: <u>Local 416</u>	
Address (Optional):	
Phone Number: <u>(714) 818-8041</u>	Email address:

Comments: this will help me see my family faster when coming to work, not just me it will help everybody to see their kids n wife or husband


1

(Space for comments continued on reverse)



PC-P33

PC-P34



I-405 Improvement Project

Public Hearing

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.





Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☒ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <u>Alfredo Peredes</u>	
Organization: <u>Labor Local 652</u>	
Address (Optional): <u>32748 Stonefield Ln Temecula, CA 92592</u>	
Phone Number: <u>(626) 625-7021</u>	Email address: <u>tatosrooster@verizon.net</u>

Comments: I think you should widen the I-405 between SR-73 and I-605 to reduce congestion. Alternative "3" seems to be the best choice not only to reduce congestion but also to put many men and women back to work here in our Great State of California.

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

From: Nancy [weposts@verizon.net]
 Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 8:16 AM
 To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
 Subject: Fw: RHA Responds to OCTA I405 Improvement Project

To whom it may concern,

We are asking that you consider the following proposal for the citizens of Rossmoor. We have lived here for 39 years and are very concerned about the impact of the congestion of traffic on the streets around are community, which is already very, very busy.

Thank you,

George and Nancy Post
 3282 Ruth Elaine Drive
 Rossmoor, CA 90720
weposts@verizon.net

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ROSSMOOR RESIDENTS & BUSINESSES

The following response to the OCTA was prepared by the RHA Traffic Committee.

Rossmoor Homeowners Association Comments and Recommendations on the EIS for the Proposed 405 Freeway Expansion

If OCTA's expansion project for the 405 goes forward, the RHA is deeply troubled by the potential for traffic congestion to occur on the northbound 405 at the Los Angeles County interface, which would cause a direct and heavy impact on the air quality inside Rossmoor. There appears to be the potential for hundreds of idling cars and trucks congested on the freeway adjacent to Rossmoor in the late afternoon and early morning, two key periods of the day that could affect residents.

The expanded 405 proposed by OCTA would have two more lanes inside Orange County than would exist in Los Angeles County, with the decrease in capacity occurring within 100 feet or less of our residential neighborhoods. Moreover, the proposed route lies within 500 feet of Hopkinson Elementary School, a sensitive receptor that was not addressed in the EIR. Section 3.2.6, the air quality analysis for the project, makes no mention of Hopkinson. The EIR identifies other sensitive receptors along the route, but neglects one of west Orange County's largest and most highly regarded schools.

The configuration of Rossmoor has the 405 literally wrapping around the southern tip of the community, exposing residents to one of the greatest impacts anywhere in the project. And yet, Rossmoor was only superficially analyzed in the air quality supplemental.

We believe the air quality impact analysis was inadequate in considering hotspots with

PC-P34 Continued

elevated levels of particulates, ozone, and other pollutants that could affect the health and quality of life in Rossmoor.

4

The OCTA air quality analysis examines, for example, carbon monoxide levels at various points along the proposed project, but not near Rossmoor. Similarly, the air toxics analysis did not adequately assess the potential for impacts on Rossmoor, particularly if congestion occurs at the county line.

5

Rossmoor is a community of both young children and elderly adults, the two most sensitive age groups to air pollution. We are asking that OCTA reexamine the air quality, traffic and noise impacts of the project on Rossmoor, especially its schools, parks and homes, and undertake a thorough and complete consideration of the most effective ways to mitigate those impacts to a level of insignificance.

6

The RHA would like OCTA to analyze whether reducing northbound lanes sequentially a mile or two before the county line would help mitigate the potential for congestion, air quality impacts and the possibility of motorists using surface streets in Los Alamitos to navigate around the chokepoint. Rather than losing two lanes at the county interface, we would like OCTA to consider squeezing down capacity miles from the county line. If and when Los Angeles County increases the capacity of the 405 in Long Beach, then the additional lanes of traffic could be opened at the county line.

7

We are also asking that OCTA conduct a better outreach effort in Rossmoor to elicit input and carry out real dialogue about the project.

8

(Note: The deadline for comments is July 17th. If you wish to voice your concerns, you may email the OCTA at 405.dedcomments.parsons@parsons.com. By law they are required to respond to all comments submitted by the July 17th deadline.)

PC-P35

My name is Tom Power. My wife Cindy and I moved into College Park East in Seal Beach in Dec. 1983 and still live there today. (3600 Sunflower Circle Seal Beach, Ca. 90740). I am writing to give you our position on the expansion of the 405. College Park East has had 2 meetings to date on this matter. The turnout was shocking. I have never seen so many people for any political meeting from our area since we have moved there. Not only was I shocked, I was also quite proud that the people who are usually so busy with their lives, they don't have time for what they perceive as trivia.....because this is not trivia. It is a very, very united bunch that for sure, 100% of the people are vehemently against ANY tolls on the 405. Below is what I took from the meeting and my personal take on the entire proposal.

1

Alternative 4: do nothing. This was what most people wanted.....status quo. The problem with that is that the voters voted yes on M which stated it wanted to expand the freeways. Our tax money is earmarked for that so in my opinion, this is not an option UNLESS the money is "somehow" in the General Fund and has been spent elsewhere. Has it???? IF true, then it should/must be brought to the attention of the taxpayers, "Because it's the right thing to do" wouldn't you agree?

2

Alternative 1: This was widely popular. EVERYBODY was in favor of this alternative. In fact it was 100% popular....make that 1000%. This is what we want. One single FREE lane on both sides. The reasons are many. We want it because we DON'T want 2 carpool lanes and we DEFINITELY don't want toll lanes. Those reasons will be addressed later. It also will be MUCH LESS costly than putting in 2 lanes, tearing down walls, making commute times unreal. Won't it????

3

It will have a major impact on the local economies. (I.E. losing sales tax dollars) Won't it???? Expanding just a lane will mean no sound walls will be dismantled and then have to be put up again. Correct????? Won't traffic will flow MUCH BETTER during construction than if the other alternatives were implemented????? It will be a huge relief to not only the citizens of Seal Beach, but also to those in Westminster, Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley and Costa

PC-P35 Continued

Mesa. Those other cities had representatives at our meeting and they feel as strong or stronger than we do. SO there will be a UNITED FRONT among those cities, for sure.

3

Alternative 2: 2 lanes in either direction had extreme opposition. Most people felt that it is a smoke screen for the toll way expansion. This is an extremely costly project to add an additional carpool lane along with the free lane. Isn't it????? Car pool lanes DO NOT WORK. They may work in cities that have a hub like DOWNTOWN Chicago, DOWNTOWN San Francisco, Downtown Detroit. We have 20 downtowns here. Long Beach, Century City, Hollywood, Santa Monica, Riverside Etc. The OCTA rep stated that Irvine has more going to it than the other direction for LA at morning rush hour. So, that is one drawback. Secondly, think about an entire week. There are 168 hours. If you use 3 hours, 6-9 am and 3 hours 4-7 PM Monday through Friday ONLY that is 30 hours a week and exactly 17.9% of the time. 17.9% is when it is "useful". As a salesman communiting all around So. Calif for 30 years, there are many days when there is complete gridlock at 12 noon and the carpool lane is empty. What a waste. Can't they change it so carpool lanes can be used on the weekend and also in non peak hours????? And if not, why not????? Most people who use the carpool do NOT use it on a regular everyday basis which is what it is intended for. Only some for private schools or colleges does it work as intended IN SOUTHERN CALIF. You can debate this all you want, skew the numbers as you like. (i.e. play word games) but it does not work as intended. It is good money after bad to pick this alternative. They don't work and you want to ADD yet another carpool lane. Is Fed money is involved for the carpool lane projects (Also OUR money)? Geez if you really want to do something FAIR for the citizens, then put a monorail system down each freeway. Then those who can't or don't drive could make use of it. Wasn't it voted down years ago????? And wasn't it because you would have to reconstruct the overpasses?.....Isn't that what they are doing right now?????

4

5

PC-P35 Continued

Alternative 3: This one is for the Toll Way and has the citizens OUTRAGED. It was pointed out at the meeting that the when the voters approved an extension of the Measure M Sales Tax in 2006, we were provided with a spending plan that included improvements on the FREEWAY. Never were the words Toll Way or other cute terms like Express Lanes or Hot lanes. Transponders were never mentioned. I read Measure M again and they are right. Doesn't it have to be included in the measure to proceed????? If the Board approves alternative 3, will it have to be on a ballot to proceed since it is not included in Measure M and therefore, the citizens have been deceived?? If they were, would the measure have passed???? I doubt it. I could be wrong though, in which case the citizens of the OC should decide that. LEGALLY! Again, people are untrusting of their government because of the deception. This doesn't even give us the free lane that WE paid for in tax money. That is how people feel. They felt VERY strongly and there were a LOT of people at the meeting and they were 100% in agreement. Nothing in this world would seem to be possible to get 100% of the people in favor of something. But you found it with the toll way. AND not only are we against it, we are STRONGLY against it. This isn't a little survey with yes or no, it is a NO AND we will be activists about it. There is no way that this is for the better good of all which we discussed and understand.

6

7

The promises and projections made by the OCTA is a joke when they point to the success of other projects. I've been told that after 15 years the 73 is operating at 40% and is a financial disaster. Is that true? It can't make its bond payments. Is that true????? WHAT A NIGHTMARE. The 91 is just awful and the poor people who live along there. This project would NOT give the people what they want, a FREE lane. The legality of this project was discussed at length as well. The citizens of Orange County are being lied to. But this is not Bell or Vernon. We will fight as hard as we can. Along with the other cities that feel the same way. And you know why, because you are "NOT doing the right thing". At the heart of it is no tolls and also the legality of toll roads in this instance because again, it was never mentioned in Measure M. FREEWAY was mentioned 150 times but NEVER Toll way. Do you agree???? This is blatantly

8

9

PC-P35 Continued

deceiving the voters, don't you think???? Do you want to know why more and more citizens are not trusting their government? This is why. The government plays word games with the public. You cannot build a toll way.... "because it's NOT the right thing to do" it's not in Measure M

9

I'd like to get into how things will affect our little world in Seal Beach if alternative 3 or 4 are passed. Without question there will be a significant increase in noise and air pollution. However, have you thought about noise and air pollution when there is no wall? It might be unlivable. Remember, that wall went up in the 70's when there was less traffic. In addition, the noise and construction of the project itself will be a contributing problem. I also found out from original homeowners at the meeting, that there was considerable crime in the late 60's and 70's to homes that lived near the freeway during the days before the wall was put up. Finally, EVERYONE was concerned about the wall not being reconstructed once it was taken down. (Remember, the government has lost the trust of the people.....and with good reason. If it is in writing.....it STILL doesn't seem to matter). Find one judge in the government's pocket and we're screwed. That is what happens on so many propositions over the years.

10

I live about 8 houses in from the wall. Moving the wall, we will lose all parking on Almond. There are about 15 streets which are all cul de sacs that intersect with Almond. With no parking on Almond, it will be a nightmare. There are at least 20 -25 days a year where there are a lot of cars parked on Almond for Mother's Day, 4th of July, Christmas Thanksgiving Graduation Parties, New Year's Eve Parties, Sunday barbeques. Also, twice a month is street cleaning and people park on Almond for that reason. Almond is also used for friends and family with Motor Homes. How embarrassing. Sorry, can't come here. Nowhere to park.

11

This is heavily impacting those that have their homes up for sale NOW. For 4-5 years, property values will go down, all along the project which certainly won't

12

PC-P35 Continued

help the property tax money flowing into Sacramento. In fact, I know a lot of people who want it reassessed if the wall comes down. Me for sure!

13

Getting onto the 405 North or south from Seal Beach Blvd is difficult as things exist right now. To get on 405 north, you need to get over 3 lanes with not a lot of time and it's always crowded. After the new project it will be extremely dangerous.

14

Who came up with the idea of all the way to the 605 anyway???? IF LA County doesn't join in the project, it's going to be nuts going from 7 lanes to 4. Talk about the all-time bottleneck. AND guess who is on the hook for that blame and the talk of how idiotic "they were" to build it that way.....The They is OCTA. I mean if you scale it down to the 22 freeway, at least there will be some time to avoid a bottleneck that otherwise might make the nightly news. NIGHTLY! It is irresponsible to run with that project without LA County. If they don't have the funds, AND THEY DON'T, then it only makes sense to add just one lane or do nothing until they can someday join the program.

15

Lampson Street is not equipped to have all of the cars that will avoid that bottleneck. People will exit the 22 and 405 and cut through, thus adding noise and air pollution completely around the entire tract of College Park East.

16

Toll lanes are unfair. Do you know how many high school and college kids will not be able to afford the toll way. (Not to mention people who are counting their pennies ...And there are a LOT these days). I'm sorry, but this toll way project benefits a very few and creates a permanent hardship for so many. The feeling at the meeting is that the OCTA doesn't care and is just a greedy bunch who cares about no one but themselves. (Sounds like people who don't trust their government).

17

I would also like to know where you came up with the projections of usage 20 years from now. I along with others highly question these numbers. The movement from South to North is maxed out pretty much. No new homes or major developments over the last 4 years has got to change your projections.

18

PC-P35 Continued

Also, people are leaving the state in droves to find work or avoid such a high tax system. It is being destroyed by politicians. So where is the growth?

18

There were a few sound suggestions at the meeting that I should mention. Many were hoping to stop the project at the 22. It would be both safer, better flow of traffic, you could someday add to this later when LA County is ready, and it would obviously save a lot of money. However, that is somewhat self-serving for Seal Beach. Another suggestion is move the center line. A 4' shoulder, a 405 realignment and the sound wall would not need to come down.

19

There are some other questions discussed: If the 14" and 16" (2 separate lines) gas/petroleum lines are relocated from the south side of the freeway to the north side into CPE, where in CPE will they go????? Again, what about the impact of such relocation construction on Almond Avenue? How do these people access their homes????? What is the impact of these gas lines in terms of safety to the residents????? They are currently on the south side of the freeway, by the SBNWS -- an accident there doesn't peril CPE residents. What kind of peril will be facing the residents of CPE for this?????

20

If the wall has to be rebuilt and moved 8-10' north, what about the existing electrical lines from SCE????? Where will they go????? All utilities in CPE are undergrounded. Will they be undergrounded?????

21

The EIR ignores the negative impacts to CPE from the increased noise and air pollution created by idling engines trying to merge down 2 lanes to go up the 405 -- prevailing on-shore winds will blow all the increased noise and air pollution into CPE degrading the quality of life for our residents -- a community of over 1,700 homes -- why was that environmental impact not listed in the EIR??????

22

PC-P35 Continued

Conclusion: We have some real MAJOR concerns. If you thought the Toll Way would meet with SOME resistance, you are wrong. You will be meeting with a HUGE amount of resistance. AND with people that are very passionate. (Talk to some of your reps that were there). This is not a threat, just a fact. I can feel it. My neighbors have NEVER pulled together like they have for this Toll way plan. If you go through with the project anyway against the will of the people, we will fight like hell to stop the project so it can go before the people so they can decide. And do you know why????..... Because it's the "right thing to do". Please do the right thing and go with alternative ONE.

23

Looking forward to answers to my questions.


Tom Power

3600 Sunflower Circle
Seal Beach, Cal. 90740

7/15/12

PC-P36

From: Tom Power [tpower@e-sbco.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2012 8:31 AM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: Last night's meeting in Seal Beach

Last night I was at a "town hall" meeting in Seal Beach/College Park East. I was blown away by the HUGE turnout. The most I have ever seen and I've lived here since 1983. The overwhelming, check that, UNANIMOUS agreement is the first option of two single lands north and south of the 405. MANY factors were discussed including both option 2 and 3 i.e. 2 lanes and 2 lanes and a toll lane. These were STRONGLY opposed with full intentions of joining Costa Mesa Hunting Beach, Westminster and Fountain Valley in opposing 2 and 3.

Toll lanes are extremely unfair to all but the wealthy. Forget studies, so many cannot afford to use it on a REGULAR basis. NOT occasionally. Everyone can/will use it occasionally. Also discussed was the possibility of implementing the rules of car pool lanes like the 22 freeway. (AND ALL of Northern Caliph if you've been there). However, as I said, we STRONGLY oppose option 2 and 3 and support option 1. (We are assuming doing nothing is not an option)

Tom Power
 3600 Sunflower Circle
 Seal Beach, Ca. 90740
 310-994-6004

1

PC-P37

Andrya N. Powers
 3354 Nevada Ave.
 Costa Mesa, CA 92626

July 16, 2012

To OCTA and CalTrans:

The following are my comments concerning the San Diego Freeway (I-405) Improvement Project.

I am against ALL options! I am against all of them because they ALL include a new Ellis on-ramp which will cause the sound wall in the Mesa Verde North area to be moved substantially closer to Residential structures and therefore residents.

There appears to be no consideration for any reconfiguration of the current onramp at Ellis Ave. If the described new on-ramp and/or current on-ramp could be reconfigured, I would support Option 1 because I know that Option 2 will be affecting the (Seal Beach) College Park Residents' sound wall, too.

I am not against the changes that need to be made to the Freeway, but I am when it actively affects Citizens' homes and quality of life both in the short and long term for no apparent reason.

Furthermore, I feel that the EIR as it currently stands is absolutely NOT complete and there is not enough information for a final decision to be made in August. I feel that all possible alternatives to adding the Ellis on-ramp have not been thoroughly explored. In addition, I feel that the environmental impact on the Residents and to California Elementary and TeWinkle Middle Schools has not been adequately researched. While these schools are not directly adjacent to the project, their school yard is within 100 yards of the proposed construction in all 3 options.

Besides my specific concerns on the EIR, I do have questions included that I would like more information about. If I need to submit those to another contact, please let me know. My further comments below are all in relation to the Ellis on-ramp construction phase on all of the options.

Background Information:

From attending the Costa Mesa Hearing, the Fountain Valley Hearing, and the Costa Mesa City Council Meeting, I have learned that due to the Ellis on-ramp reconfiguration, the sound wall between my home and the freeway will move 22 feet closer to my house. That will now be 5-6 feet from my property line. A 15 foot retaining wall will be built and on top of that a 12 foot sound wall will be built. In addition, at the Fountain Valley Hearing I spoke to an Engineer who said that my wall on my current property line will be removed and a footer for the retaining wall will need to come partially into my property (approximately 1 foot). He said they will need access to my yard. I have since spoke to Christina Byrne

1

2

PC-P37 Continued

and she said that when she looked into it she was told there will need to be a construction easement, but the wall will not need to be removed.

- Will access to my property be needed for this construction? If so, to what extent?

The On-Ramp Itself:

1. What is the reason for the change to the on-ramp? From my understanding it is to prepare for the projected increase in traffic over the next 30 years. However, from what I can tell, all the land surrounding is already built out. There is no anticipation of more housing to be built. So where would this increase in traffic on Ellis come from? And wouldn't the additional lanes from Magnolia and Brookhurst/Talbert also work toward reducing the Ellis traffic?
2. I CANNOT understand why even more lanes need to be added for this on-ramp south of the Santa Ana River. There are already SEVEN lanes at that stretch of the freeway. It is one of the widest stretches of the entire freeway. If the on-ramp needs to be added there has got to be a way to do that within the current 7 lanes. I can't imagine that one on-ramp would cause the need for a NINE lane freeway.
3. Has there been a traffic study done on where the traffic is coming from? Has there been a traffic study on the impact of improved traffic circulation due to reconfigurations of Magnolia, Brookhurst/Talbert and increased flow on the 405 itself?
 - a. After the freeway is widened at Magnolia, Brookhurst/Talbert, will there still be a need to change the configuration? I can only assume that with easier access to the freeway, Citizens would be more apt to take those on-ramps, thus, reducing the traffic on the Ellis on-ramp.
4. I have observed the Ellis SB on-ramp during rush hour morning traffic and noticed that the main reason there is a backup is because of the "meter" light which restricts traffic entering the freeway. Even though there are 2 lanes on the on-ramp and 2 entry lanes from Ellis, the traffic has to stop even if their traffic light is green because the meter is not allowing cars to enter the freeway. Has changing the timing of the meter or changing it from 1 car per light to 2 cars per light been considered? If this option hasn't been tried, we should not be adding an Ellis on-ramp until we have done so.
5. Has adding a third lane to the current on-ramp (to store more cars waiting for access to the freeway) been a consideration?
6. Has adding additional lanes to the Magnolia and/or Brookhurst/Talbert on-ramp been considered? It seems short-sighted to build an entire new ramp, move the sound wall, build more freeway, build retaining walls and deal with the effects on Residents without adding on to where construction is already occurring.
7. It is interesting that the configuration was able to be done in a way to accommodate the Sanitation District Driveway, but cannot be modified in a way to reduce the inconvenience and negative effects it will have on the quality of life for the Mesa Verde North Residents.

PC-P37 Continued

Structure:

1. The houses in the Mesa Verde North Track are not like your standard single family residence built in Costa Mesa. They have zero lot lines and several homes have a "back yard" that wraps around the house in an L or U formation. In addition, for several of these houses, like mine, this means my house is 10 feet from the property line. Most houses in Costa Mesa have a full back yard, ours do not. Because of the zero property line, instead of a fence between us and our neighbor, we have a 10 foot wall which is actually the exterior side of our neighbor's house. If the sound wall is moved in this will create a dry hot terrarium-like environment due to the close proximity of the houses in this area.

- a. I understand that all structures will be physically within the freeway right of way. However, have there been sufficient studies to discover if there is any potential for damage to my house? There will be active construction and pile driving less than 15 feet from the actual structure of my home. I have heard from neighbors that when the last sound wall was built several people experienced structural damage and cracked foundations. At the June 19th Costa Mesa City Council Meeting a resident living near the Fairview Bridge experienced foundation issues when the bridge was re-built.
- b. It was explained to me at the Fountain Valley Hearing that due to the height of the retaining wall, part of the footer would actually have to come in to my property. Will the foundation of my house have to be reinforced? If a pool is put in too close, the foundation of the house needs to be reinforced; I can only imagine that would apply to supporting a freeway, too.
- c. Is it safe to have a sound wall/retaining wall 15 to 16 feet from the physical building? My children's rooms are at that end of the house and will be the 15 to 16 feet from the sound wall.
- d. With the widening of the freeway and a 15 foot retaining wall being put in, that will literally put the freeway above my house. Have there been studies done for the safety to the residents in this situation? What level of impact will be protected from penetration by the final Retaining Wall/Sound Wall? If, for example, a truck was to crash through the sound wall as planned, it will only have 15 feet to travel before hitting my house. Since the wall is now closer to my house by 22 ft. and several feet above my house, the trajectory of travel with no contact with the ground will most likely cause the truck to land on top of my home.
- e. Is there a code or pre-determining distance a sound wall/retaining wall can be from a house? Does the City's or State Building code dictate how far a house must be from such a structure?
- f. The property line walls built are not very solid. They will probably not hold up to the adjacent construction.

Maintenance:

PC-P37 Continued

1. Who will be responsible for maintaining the leftover 5-6 feet of right-of-way? It has yet to be maintained for the last 10 months we've owned our home. We were constantly inspecting it for the 9 months prior to purchasing it and there was no maintenance during that time. According to the neighbors it has been several years since it has been maintained. If it is this unimportant to maintain at approximately 27 feet, how can we expect the 5-6 feet to be maintained? Most equipment won't fit an area of that size.

16

Construction:

1. What hours and days of the week will construction occur? Our neighbor, who was living in his house on Nevada Ave. when the current sound wall was built, said that construction most of the time was around the clock. Large lights were brought in to do work at night and there were several sleepless nights.
2. How long is the construction from Moon Park to Harbor Blvd. expected to last?
3. We just bought our house and unfortunately this expansion was not disclosed. We still do not have blinds on most of our sliding glass doors. Will we lose all privacy? Will privacy screening be provided?
4. What pre-cautions will be taken during the period that access will be needed to my property?
 - a. How long will construction that specifically needs access to my property last for?
 - b. How long will I need to tell my children they cannot play outside for?
 - c. Will my backyard/house be exposed to the freeway? Will motorists be able to see us?
 - d. Will there be tarps or will temporary fencing be provided?
 - e. How will my home and yard be protected from potential criminals?
 - f. How will my property be protected from snakes and other dangerous pests disrupted due to the construction?
5. Children's lungs are still developing into their teens. Who do I call if my children develop lung/breathing issues? What remedies will be provided to protect them against breathing the dusty and polluted air during construction?
6. If you need construction access to my property, how far into my property will your activities impact?

17

18

19

20

21

22

Compensation:

1. What kind of compensation can we expect from a project like this?
 - a. How will we be compensated for our homes decrease in value?
 - b. What will be done to mitigate the extra heat that will be not only generated from the wall itself that will be 22 feet closer to our home, but also from the reduced airflow that we'll experience due to the reduced cross sectional area of free wind movement.
 - c. Will there be new, tall landscape to act as screening and heat deflection? If so, will we have a say in what is chosen?

23

PC-P37 Continued

- d. How will we be compensated for the new view of a 27-foot wall in our yard? Will there be mature and tall landscaping installed to camouflage the wall? If so, will we have a say in what is chosen?
- e. The property line walls built are not very solid. They will probably not hold up to the adjacent construction. If they are damaged, will our property walls get replaced? Who will pay for them? Will we have to find our own contractor to do this?
- f. We have planter boxes with irrigation and landscape against our back wall. How will this get replaced, repaired, etc.? We also have large juniper trees; will those get moved or replaced?
- g. If the property line wall is removed and it affects the planter boxes, it will affect the concrete, as well. If the concrete needs to be repaired, will all of it in our backyard be replaced so it matches?
- h. How will we be compensated for any resulting damage to our house? What if we experience cracks in our foundation? What if it causes our house to sink toward the freeway? What if we get cracks in our walls?
- i. What mitigation measures will be used to minimize the construction dirt, dust, noise and what standard will be used to determine the efficiency of those measures?
- j. How will we be compensated for the increase in dust, dirt, and pollen? Will there be a domestic cleaning crew hired to help homeowners with the extra cleaning requirements caused by your construction?
 - i. Who will be responsible if my young children develop asthma, breathing problems, or other medical issues? Who do I call, specifically?
- k. My husband drives for a living and it is a safety issue for him and the public that he gets ample sleep. Can we be guaranteed no night disturbances? If he needs to call in sick due to night construction how will we be compensated?
- l. What is the potential for temporary relocation?

23

I implore upon you to please look deeper into another alternative for the reconfiguration of the Ellis on-ramp that will not affect the Residents.

PC-P38

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Powers [mailto:omdpowers@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2012 7:56 AM

To: Christina Byrne

Subject:

y name is David Powers. I live at 3354 Nevada Ave., Costa Mesa 92626. I am very upset about the project that the OCTA is doing to the 405. I am directly affected by the new on ramp on Ellis. The sound wall is going to move 21 feet toward my house that means it will be at my property line. And construction is going to be horrible for me and my family. At the meeting, nobody seemed to answer my questions or most avoided me, including you. Nobody has come down my street to see what is really going on with the sound wall and how it's going to affect the neighborhood. I think the OCTA is doing what's best for them and not the community. The property value of my home is going to take a dive. Who is going to take care of the extra costs? Not to mention the mess and the heat it's going to make on my home. I know there is a different way to reroute the Ellis on ramp to where it's not going to affect the 7 or 8 house on my street. I know we're the little fish in a big pond, but the thought in the OCTA's mind is "oh well, it's only 7 or 8 houses that we're going to ruin." The meeting was a joke. They were not even going to let us talk if it was not for that old man that stood up and said something. You guys would just have walked away and left it at what it was. I will tell you I going to fight this Ellis off ramp to the end. I will get a hold of everybody I can (politicians, lawyers and environmentalist) to change this plan. I'm not saying stop all construction I know something needs to get done but you are not thinking what is the right thing to do. I invite you to come to my house to see what you are going to do to these homes on Nevada Ave. And this will not be the only letter I will be writing.
A very upset homeowner, David Powers.
949-433-6939 Feel free to contact me.

1

PC-P39

From:

Kelly Powers [powerskpb@yahoo.com]

Sent:

Monday, July 16, 2012 5:54 PM

To:

Parsons, 405.dedcomments

Hello, Chairman Glaab, Vice Chair Winterbottom, Director Amante, Supervisor Bates, Supervisor Cambell, Director Cavetche, Director Crandeall, Director Dalton, Director Galloway, Director Hanson, Director Hennessey, Director Herzog, Supervisor Moorlach, Supervisor Nelson, Supervisor Nguyen, Director Pulido, Director Green.

If you could forward this to the OCTA board's members I would appreciate it. I tried to find their email addresses but was not successful in my endeavors.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my adamant and extreme opposition to the alternative 3 for the 405 improvement project. We, the tax payers, did not vote on this alternative. We voted on adding a lane not adding a tax. This is taxation without representation. I do not believe we should go the direction of an elitist society where our public highways cater to the rich. They would be taking away a carpool lane and negating all the work that has been done to add HOV connectors which would now become (Lexus Lanes) toll roads.

I will be publicly announcing the outrage via Facebook and Twitter of what the board of directors is trying to put over on the tax payers by voting on a TOLL road when their constituents they are representing do not want this. They are elected officials and should be voting on the best interest of who they represent not what they want!!!! If the board goes through with this vote against what the voter support I will help launch a campaign to oust the board members who are voting for the "cash cow" similar to the 91 and not the interest of the voters. This project is has the board members blinded by the revenues it would produce and are not looking and the long term best interest of the voters.

1

I attended three public meetings and did not hear one person in favor of alternative 3 but to my disbelief the board of directors is still considering this alternative. That is in direct conflict with the voters that put them in office. NOT ONE PERSON IN FAVOR. Who are they listening to?

The website is not even clearly depicting what alternative 3 is really proposing, that the carpool lane is going away. Now requiring 3 riders plus and a fastrack transponder. You are taking away a tax payer generated HOV lane and replacing it with your managed "Lexus" lanes in which only your board members with decide where all the money will go. Why should my road be taxed? Again, "taxation without representation".

Thank you for your dedication, do the right thing! VOTE NO ON ALTERNATIVE 3!

Kelly Powers

6173 Stonebridge Ave
Westminster, CA. 92683
714.392.2929

PC-P40

From: Stephanie Pszyk [stephanie_pszyk@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 3:22 PM
To: Parsons, 405.cedcomments
Subject: I-405 & College Park East

To whom it may concern and or Smita Deshpande:

I am resident of College Park East and reside near the wall along Almond Avenue. I am very concerned that the moving of the wall will create larger issues for all residents of College Park East. Living on a cul de sac (Dahlia Circle) parking on the street has been difficult. Not to mention the amount of traffic that we see every day on Almond Avenue which provides us our "overflow parking" when there are no parking spots on our street. Almond Avenue is the main artery in accessing 19 streets and cul de sacs and 2 parks. And not just for cars. Many pedestrians use the street as well. Moving our beautifully landscaped wall will eliminate our parking and safety to anyone who accesses the street daily. Another concern is the noise and environmental issues. The noise level is quite loud to say the least especially when you have many freeways coming together. (I invite any of you to stay in house along Almond Avenue to hear the noise level for yourselves) Coupled with the noise are the toxins that come from the automobiles using these freeways. Those who live quite close to the wall can assure you that the inside of their homes also take a beating from the pollution, tire grit, and freeway grime. Moving the wall closer could also impact health problems. I encourage you to really think about the impact for the home owners here in College Park East and find a longer term solution on the opposite side of the freeway.

Regards,
Stephanie

1

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-P

Response to Comment Letter PC-P1

Comment PC-P1-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P2

Comment PC-P2-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P3

Comment PC-P3-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P4

Comment PC-P4-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-P4-2

The project includes Measures VIS-1 through VIS-4, VIS-6 through VIS-9, and VIS-18 through VIS-20 related to preservation of existing vegetation and replacement vegetation.

Comment PC-P4-3

Replacement of existing soundwalls in-kind is based on the height of the existing soundwall. Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment PC-P4-4

Relocation of the existing poles and overhead lines next to the existing soundwall along Almond Avenue is not required for Alternative 1. Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of these existing poles and overhead lines. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3, which would not require relocation of the existing poles and overhead lines. Please see Response to Comment PC-P4-3.

Comment PC-P4-5

There are two types of noise barriers “replacement in-kind” as part of the design features for this project. The first in-kind replacement occurs when an existing soundwall must be removed, relocated, and replaced in-kind along the project alignment where space is needed for the proposed project’s additional lanes and required safety features. The second in-kind replacement is needed where parts of an existing overpass embankment that blocks traffic noise in the existing setting has to be removed.

Under Alternative 1, the existing 18-ft-high soundwall along Almond Avenue would remain as-is and untouched. Since the public meetings, design modifications were made to Alternative 3 that would allow the same existing soundwall to also remain as-is; however, the design changes required to change Alternative 2 enough to allow the existing wall to remain as-is are not acceptable to current design and safety standards. Under Alternative 2, sections of the existing soundwall would need to be removed, relocated, and replaced in-kind along the project alignment where space is needed for the proposed project’s additional lanes and required safety features. The current maximum preferred height for soundwalls in California is 16 ft due to seismic issues; however, this soundwall would be replaced at the original 18-ft height due to the policy of in-kind replacement.

Soundwall S1142 is shown in Figures 21 and 22 in Appendix N – Noise Information within the Draft EIR/EIS. The replace in-kind symbology is used in place of the existing wall symbology where portions of the existing wall would need to be modified for the project.

Please also see Common Responses – Almond Avenue Soundwall and Noise/Noise Analysis.

Comment PC-P4-6

Please see Response to Comment PC-P4-3.

Comment PC-P4-7

Please see Common Response – Measure M Funding.

Comment PC-P4-8

As described in Section 3.2.6 of the Draft EIR/EIS, emissions will be reduced under all of the build alternatives compared to the future No Build Alternative, and no permanent adverse project-related air quality effects were identified. Please see Common Response – Air Quality.

With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles County line, a Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared to address potential operational concerns in the city of Long Beach and Los Angeles County, and Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS was updated accordingly. Please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Comment PC-P4-9

All comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS have been responded to and are included in Appendix **R** of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment PC-P4-10

Renewed Measure M was passed by the voters of Orange County, and the proposed project was included in that measure. For additional information, please see Common Response – Measure M Funding.

Comment PC-P4-11

Project-related construction and operational air quality and noise effects were analyzed in detail in the project Air Quality Technical Study and Noise Study Report. As described in Sections 3.2.6 and 3.2.7, project-related emission and noise levels associated with any of the three build alternatives would be less than the future No Build Alternative.

Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification, Noise/Noise Analysis, Air Quality, and Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P5

Comment PC-P5-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred

Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Response to Comment PC-B20-1.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P6

Comment PC-P6-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment PC-P6-2

MSATs have the greatest potential to affect the health of residents located adjacent to the project. Although the various alternatives would place travel lanes closer to some residences, it is anticipated that MSAT exposure, including DPM, would be less than existing conditions. MSAT emissions are likely lower than existing levels in the design year as a result of EPA's and California's control programs that are projected to further reduce MSAT emissions. Please see Common Response – Health Risks.

The I-405 Improvement Project may have an effect on property values, but it is not likely to be a major change because I-405 is an existing facility within Orange County. In addition, Caltrans has found no literature, studies, or evidence that property values decrease because of freeway widening near a home. Please see Common Response – Property Values.

Comment PC-P6-3

Please see Response to Comment PC-P6-1 and Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P7

Comment PC-P7-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred

Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment PC-P7-2

Relocating the gas lines in College Park East is one of three options. The option (Option 1) that retains the gas/petroleum lines on the south side of I-405 within Navy jurisdiction is the preferred option and will be pursued. Please see Common Response – Relocation of Gas Lines.

Comment PC-P7-3

Please see Response to Comment PC-P7-1.

Comment PC-P7-4

The I-405 Improvement Project may have an effect on property values, but it is not likely to be a major change because I-405 is an existing facility within Orange County. In addition, Caltrans has found no literature, studies, or evidence that property values decrease because of freeway widening near a home. Please see Common Response – Property Values.

Comment PC-P7-5

Please see Common Response – Compensation for Construction Impacts.

Comment PC-P7-6

Please see Response to Comment PC-P7-1.

Comment PC-P7-7

Please see Response to Comment PC-P7-1.

Comment PC-P7-8

Project-related construction and operational air quality and noise effects were analyzed in detail in the project Air Quality Technical Study and Noise Study Report. As described in Section 3.2.6 of the Draft EIR/EIS, project-related air emissions associated with the Preferred Alternative would be less than the future No Build Alternative.

Please also see Common Responses – Air Quality and Noise/Noise Analysis.

Comment PC-P7-9

Please see Response to Comment PC-P7-1.

Comment PC-P7-10

Please see Response to Comment PC-P7-1.

Comment PC-P7-11

Please see Response to Comment PC-P7-2.

Comment PC-P7-12

With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles County line, a Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared to address potential operational concerns in the city of Long Beach and Los Angeles County, and Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS was updated accordingly. Please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Comment PC-P7-13

With respect to coordination with Los Angeles County, please see Common Response – Coordination between Caltrans Districts 7 and 12, OCTA, Los Angeles Metro, COG, and the City of Long Beach.

Comment PC-P7-14

Please see Response to Comment PC-P7-12.

Comment PC-P7-15

As described in Section 3.2.6 of the Draft EIR/EIS, emissions will be reduced under all of the build alternatives compared to the future No Build Alternative, and no permanent adverse project-related air quality effects were identified.

Comment PC-P7-16

MSATs have the greatest potential to affect health of the residents located adjacent to the project. Although the various alternatives would place travel lanes closer to some residences, it is anticipated that MSAT exposure, including DPM, would be less than existing conditions. MSAT emissions are likely lower than existing levels in the design year as a result of EPA's and California's control programs that are projected to further reduce MSAT emissions. Please see Common Response – Health Risks.

Comment PC-P7-17

Under the No Build Alternative, vehicles entering I-405 northbound from Seal Beach Boulevard must merge one lane left to access I-605 and one more lane left to continue on I-405 northbound. Under all of the build alternatives, one lane change plus a lane merge downstream of the SR-22 westbound off-ramp would be required to reach I-605 and two additional lane changes to reach I-405.

Comment PC-P7-18

Based on the Traffic Study conducted for the Draft EIR/EIS, the project includes improvements to Seal Beach Boulevard under all of the build alternatives.

Comment PC-P7-19

We acknowledge the opposition to tolling, and it will be considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative. Please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

Comment PC-P7-20

Under Alternative 3, HOVs would use the Express Lanes free, provided they meet the occupancy eligibility requirement. If HOVs with only two occupants choose not to use the Express Lanes, toll prices will be adjusted to attract replacement vehicles to the Express Lanes. The volume of traffic in the Express Lanes is independent of the occupancy requirement for free HOV use of the Express Lanes. Because the Express Lanes have more throughput during congested hours than the GP lanes, the GP lanes will benefit from diversion of traffic from the GP lanes to the Express Lanes.

Comment PC-P7-21

The experience on SR-91 is that motorists from all income groups use the Express Lanes. No one is obligated to use the Express Lanes in Alternative 3. Express Lanes provide an option for a reliable uncongested trip in exchange for payment of a toll.

Comment PC-P7-22

Slow-moving congested freeway lanes have lower and unstable throughput compared to uncongested lanes. During peak periods, the GP lanes on I-405 are forecast to be heavily congested with lower throughput (approximately 1,200 vehicles per lane per hour) than the Express Lanes, whose throughput will be managed to approximately 1,700 vehicles per lane per hour. For an explanation of how this management works, see the Draft EIR/EIS, page 2-20. By providing more throughput per lane through management of the Express Lanes, traffic in the GP lanes would be reduced and congestion eased; for two conditions with the same total number of lanes and congested conditions, congestion in the GP lanes would be less if two of the lanes were managed to increase their throughput. Because the Express Lanes can carry more traffic than the congested GP lanes, the additional increment of traffic carried by the Express Lanes would be removed from the GP lanes, thereby reducing the volume of traffic and level of congestion in the GP lanes. Please see the rows of Table 3.1.6-14 labeled “Brookhurst Street to SR-22 East” for a comparison of the throughput of Alternatives 2 and 3 with the same total number of lanes.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P8**Comment PC-P8-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-P8-2

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment PC-P8-3

With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles county line, a Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared to address potential operational concerns in the city of Long Beach and Los Angeles County, and Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS was updated accordingly. Please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line. With the Preferred Alternative, traffic entering from the Seal Beach Boulevard loop on-ramp would need to change one lane to stay on I-405.

Comment PC-P8-4

With the additional lane being added, the configuration at the location of the Seal Beach Boulevard on-ramp and the downstream 7th Street exit will remain as the conditions proposed for the WCC Project, where one lane shift is required to stay on I-405.

Comment PC-P8-5

Please see Response to Comment PC-P7-22.

It is correct that access to the Express Lanes will be limited.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P9**Comment PC-P9-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles County line, a Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared to address potential operational concerns in the city of Long Beach and Los Angeles County, and Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS was updated accordingly. Please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Comment PC-P9-2

Safety is of the utmost concern and is built into the design. Appropriate lengths for merge conditions have been provided. Furthermore, the additional lanes involved with the project improvements have been closely analyzed to benefit the traveling public.

Comment PC-P9-3

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment PC-P9-4

The specific language in Measure M2 with respect to Project K states that the project would “add new lanes to the San Diego Freeway [I-405] between I-605 and SR-55, generally within the existing ROW. The project will make best use of available freeway property, update interchanges, and widen all local overcrossings according to city and regional master plans.” This language does not explicitly preclude use of Measure M2 funding for tolled facilities, nor does Measure M2 limit transportation improvements to those specified in the measure. Please see Common Response – Measure M Funding.

Comment PC-P9-5

Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P10

Comment PC-P10-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P11

Comment PC-P11-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred

Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P12

Comment PC-P12-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P13

Comment PC-P13-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P14

Comment PC-P14-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P15

Comment PC-P15-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred

Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P16

Comment PC-P16-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P17

Comment PC-P17-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P18

Comment PC-P18-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P19

Comment PC-P19-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification and Opposition to Tolling.

Respuesta a la Carta De Comentario PC-P20

Comentario PC-P20-1

Las agencias de Caltrans y Orange County Transportation Authority les gustaría agradecerle por haber participado en el proceso ambiental para el proyecto de ampliación de la autopista de San

Diego (I-405). Su comentario fue considerado durante el proceso de selección de la “Alternative Preferida”, como esta escrito en el reporte llamando en ingles “I-405 Improvement Project Final EIR/EIS.” Se le notificará en la dirección proveida en su Cometario cuando el reporte “Final EIR/EIS” va a estar disponible para revisarlo.

Response to Comment Letter Translation PC-P20

Comment PC-P20-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P21

Comment PC-P21-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification and Opposition to Tolling.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P22

Comment PC-P22-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

The Draft EIR/EIS documents existing and anticipated congestion on I-405 in the project area in Tables 3.1.6-4, 3.1.6-5, 3.1.6-12, and 3.1.6-13. Alternative 3 includes tolled Express Lanes in the median of I-405. Transit vehicles will use the Express Lanes without a toll.

BRT in the median of I-405 was considered in the Draft EIR/EIS. Alternatives M8 and M11, covered respectively on pages 2-44 and 2-47, included BRT with stations in the median of I-405 beneath overcrossing bridges. These alternatives are included in the Draft EIR/EIS in Section 2.2.7, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Consideration. That section explains each of those alternatives and why they were eliminated. For a graphic summary of those alternatives,

please see Figure 2-8 of the Final EIR/EIS. Please also see Common Response – Elimination of LRT and BRT Alternatives.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P23

Comment PC-P23-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

We appreciate the identification of other potential improvements on Orange County freeways. Renewed Measure M was passed by the voters of Orange County, and the proposed project was included in that measure. For additional information, please see Common Response – Measure M Funding.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P24

Comment PC-P24-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification and Opposition to Tolling.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P25

Comment PC-P25-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P26

Comment PC-P26-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred

Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

The SR-91 Express Lanes are considered successful traffic management. They do not eliminate congestion in the GP lanes; they provide an option to that congestion to motorists willing to pay a toll. The tolls are set at the rates necessary to maintain high-speed operations. For an explanation of how this management works, see the Draft EIR/EIS, page 2-20. For additional information, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

All of the build alternatives are anticipated to reduce congestion in the I-405 corridor; none are expected to eliminate congestion in the corridor, including Alternative 2, which would add two GP lanes in each direction. The levels of congestion expected under each of the build alternatives are summarized in the Final EIR/EIS in Tables 3.1.6-4 through 3.1.6-8 and Tables 3.1.6-12 through 3.1.6-14.

Comment PC-P26-2

No one is obligated to use the Express Lanes in Alternative 3. Express Lanes provide an option for a reliable uncongested trip in exchange for payment of a toll. OCTA has indicated that improvements to I-405 in addition to those identified in Alternative 1 would not be funded with Renewed Measure M revenues. The additional increment of cost of Alternative 3 compared to Alternative 1 would be bonded against anticipated toll revenue and not require any additional taxes.

Comment PC-P26-3

The masonry block construction of proposed soundwalls is the current design and application standard under the State of California. Any additional aesthetic treatments are on a project-to-project basis. During final design, workshops regarding aesthetic treatments could occur that involve stakeholders and city representatives that received input from the residents and public.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P27

Comment PC-P27-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P28

Comment PC-P28-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P29

Comment PC-P29-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Comment PC-P29-2

Caltrans and OCTA acknowledge your support for the project. Please note that the project will not reduce traffic but would reduce traffic congestion on I-405.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P30

Comment PC-P30-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

With respect to the I-605 southbound GP connector to I-405 southbound, Alternatives 1 and 2, as presented in the Draft EIR/EIS, would provide two full lanes from I-605 southbound onto southbound I-405. Alternative 3, as shown in the Draft EIR/EIS, would provide a single lane; however, this may be reconsidered during final design.

The current delay from I-405 southbound to eastbound SR-22 will be relieved when construction of the WCC Project is complete and the branch connector restored to its preconstruction number of lanes and the new HOV direct connector from the southbound I-405 HOV lanes to the eastbound SR-22 HOV lane.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P31**Comment PC-P31-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Only Alternative 3 would require replacement of the Fairview Road Overcrossing. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid replacement of the Fairview Road Overcrossing under Alternative 3. Please see Common Response – Replacement of Fairview Road Overcrossing/Truncation of Tolloed Express Lanes.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P32**Comment PC-P32-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P33**Comment PC-P33-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P34**Comment PC-P34-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Comment PC-P34-2

Please see Response to Comment CG4-1.

Comment PC-P34-3

Please see Response to Comment CG4-2.

Comment PC-P34-4

Please see Response to Comment CG4-3.

Comment PC-P34-5

Hopkinson Elementary School was considered in the Draft EIR/EIS, as applicable. Hopkinson Elementary School was evaluated as a potential Section 4(f) resource and is shown in Table 2 and Figure 2 of Appendix B as it relates to Section 4(f). Hopkinson Elementary School is also shown as Number 32 in Figure 3.1.1-4 in the Draft EIR/EIS. The Draft EIR/EIS evaluated sensitive air quality receptors within 500 ft of the centerline, and no significant air quality effects on any sensitive receptor were identified. Hopkinson Elementary School is located greater than 500 ft from the centerline (see Figure 3.2.6-3); therefore, no substantial project-related effects on air quality at Hopkinson Elementary School are anticipated. Additionally, the nearest representative noise receptors (R6.48, R6.49, R6.50, R6.51, and R6.52) are shown in L-26 in Appendix N5, which are protected by 14- to 16-ft-high soundwalls. As shown in Appendix N1 (Table G-18, page G-80), there is no change in dBA between existing and future build noise levels for the Preferred Alternative at R6.48 through R6.51. At R6.52, there is a reduction of 4 dBA between the existing and design year build (Preferred Alternative) noise level. Hopkinson Elementary School is located approximately 275 ft and two rows of houses farther east than R6.48 and R6.53. No project-related increases in noise at Hopkinson Elementary School are anticipated.

Comment PC-P34-6

Please see Response to Comment CG4-4.

Comment PC-P34-7

Please see Response to Comment CG4-5.

Comment PC-P34-8

Please see Response to Comment CG4-6.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P35

Comment PC-P35-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in

your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-P35-2

There is an established process to change the priorities embedded in the Renewed Measure M extension. Section 12 of Ordinance No. 3 Renewed Measure M Transportation Ordinance and Investment Plan (available at <http://www.octa.net/pdf/m2ordinance.pdf>) documents that process.

Comment PC-P35-3

We acknowledge the support of the comment for Alternative 1. With respect to differences in cost, Table 1-10 on page 1-18 in the Final EIR/EIS shows the total costs of the build alternatives. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-P35-4

None of the proposed build alternatives would add an additional HOV lane.

Comment PC-P35-5

Changing the HOV lanes to part time is not part of the proposed build alternatives. The Financial Plan shows the sources of funding for the Preferred Alternative.

Alternatives with LRT and BRT are included in the Draft EIR/EIS in Section 2.2.7, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Consideration. That section explains each of those alternatives and why they were eliminated. Please also see Common Response – Elimination of LRT and BRT Alternatives.

All of the overcrossing bridges from Ward Street to Bolsa Chica Road will require replacement under any of the build alternatives.

Comment PC-P35-6

There is nothing in Renewed Measure M that either precludes or requires additional improvements beyond the single GP lane proposed in Alternative 1. OCTA has indicated that improvements to I-405 in addition to those identified in Alternative 1 would not be funded with Renewed Measure M revenues. There is no plan for a voter referendum on the I-405 Improvement Project.

Comment PC-P35-7

Please see Response to Comment PC-P35-6.

Comment PC-P35-8

The financial problems of the SR-73 toll road located in southern Orange County are well known. All motorists pay a toll to use that road. The tolled Express Lanes proposed in Alternative 3 are only two lanes of I-405 in each direction. The remainder of the lanes on I-405 remains free, and HOVs meeting the occupancy requirement will use the Express Lanes free. For additional information, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

The SR-91 Express Lanes are considered successful traffic management. They do not eliminate congestion in the GP lanes; they provide an option to that congestion to motorists willing to pay a toll. The tolls are set at the rates necessary to maintain high-speed operations. For an explanation of how this management works, please see the Draft EIR/EIS, page 2-20. For additional information, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

Comment PC-P35-9

Please see Response to Comment PC-P35-7.

Comment PC-P35-10

Caltrans and OCTA have made design revisions to the build alternatives, as discussed in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR/EIS, to avoid many of the community concerns/impacts identified during the Draft EIR/EIS public comment period. As a result of these design revisions, relocation of the soundwall adjacent to Almond Avenue is no longer required for Alternative 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment PC-P35-11

Please see Response to Comment PC-P35-10.

Comment PC-P35-12

Please see Common Response – Property Values.

Comment PC-P35-13

Please see Response to Comment PC-P35-10.

Comment PC-P35-14

The conditions will not be the same as during construction activities during the WCC Project. As proposed in the Preferred Alternative, only one lane shift will be required coming onto I-405 via the Seal Beach Boulevard on-ramp.

Comment PC-P35-15

With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles County line, a Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared to address potential operational concerns in the city of Long Beach and Los Angeles County, and Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS was updated accordingly. Please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Comment PC-P35-16

Please see Response to Comment PC-P35-15.

Comment PC-P35-17

No one is obligated to use the Express Lanes in Alternative 3. Express Lanes provide an option for a reliable uncongested trip in exchange for payment of a toll.

Comment PC-P35-18

Please see Section 3.1.2, Growth, of the Draft EIR/EIS for growth inducement analysis.

Comment PC-P35-19

Please see Response to Comment PC-P35-10.

Comment PC-P35-20

Relocating the gas lines in College Park East is one of three options. The option (Option 1) that retains the gas/petroleum lines on the south side of I-405 within Navy jurisdiction is the preferred option and will be pursued.

Comment PC-P35-21

Please see Response to Comment PC-P35-10.

Comment PC-P35-22

Sections 3.2.6, Air Quality, and 3.2.7, Noise, of the Draft EIR/EIS adequately analyze the air quality and noise impacts from the project. Please see Common Responses – Air Quality and Noise/Noise Analysis.

Comment PC-P35-23

Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification and Opposition to Tolling.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P36**Comment PC-P36-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred

Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification and Opposition to Tolling.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P37

Comment PC-P37-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Alternatives to the alignment of the new on-ramp from Ellis Avenue were considered during the draft phase. The proposed alignment provides the most advantageous operation while upholding safety by allowing sufficient storage capacity during ramp metering.

Comment PC-P37-2

Please see Response to Comment PC-P37-1. Construction of the soundwall on retaining wall would be manageable from the freeway side due to the 5 to 6 feet of buffer.

Comment PC-P37-3

The main purpose for the new on-ramp is to alleviate the intersection used to serve the southbound ramps, Ellis Avenue/Euclid Street, and the OCSD property. Currently, during AM peak period, the left-turn movement onto the southbound on-ramp impacts Ellis Avenue to the south. The new ramp would allow direct access to the southbound on-ramp without impacting the southbound Euclid Street traffic.

Comment PC-P37-4

The heavy volume entering the southbound I-405 from the existing and proposed on-ramps at the Euclid Street/Ellis Avenue interchange requires an auxiliary lane.

Comment PC-P37-5

A Traffic Study for the project was completed and is summarized in Section 3.1.6 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Comment PC-P37-6

Increasing the number of vehicles discharged by the ramp meter will increase the flow of traffic entering I-405 and increase the turbulence and congestion in the traffic stream on I-405.

Comment PC-P37-7

To address the queue on Ellis Avenue, the volume of traffic entering I-405 from the existing ramp would exceed the capacity of the on-ramp at the point where it becomes a single lane downstream of the ramp meter. The second on-ramp is needed to distribute the traffic to two separate entrances so that it can smoothly join the traffic stream on I-405.

Comment PC-P37-8

The proposed on-ramp from Ellis Avenue would alleviate the local traffic from driving north to access the southbound I-405. The new ramp provides direct access to I-405. Note that without the new ramp, the existing soundwall would still need to be reconstructed on a retaining wall closer to the Mesa Verde residents based on the additional lane created from the southbound loop on-ramp from Ellis Avenue/Euclid Street.

Comment PC-P37-9

Please see Response to Comment PC-P37-1.

Comment PC-P37-10

A measure is in place in Table S-1, Project Impact Summary Table, Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures. GEO-7 discusses compliance with geotechnical and seismic safety standards and practices included in the final design package. In addition, during the design phase, special provisions under the structures section will contain language as part of the vibration and monitoring plan for contingencies for structures that may be damaged due to construction activities.

Comment PC-P37-11

Based on current retaining wall standards and the buffer between the ROW and the proposed retaining wall, sufficient clearance is available to construct the entire footing in State ROW.

Comment PC-P37-12

Horizontal clearance between elevated highway structures, such as freeway viaducts and ramps and adjoining buildings, is 15 ft. Because the soundwall and retaining wall is not elevated, clearance should be met. The foundation to support the soundwall and retaining wall would be designed and specified to meet the latest seismic codes in California.

Comment PC-P37-13

Please see Response to Comment PC-P37-12. In addition, a concrete barrier on the freeway side of the soundwall would shield any errant vehicles from going over to the adjacent property.

Comment PC-P37-14

Please see Response to Comment PC-P37-12.

Comment PC-P37-15

Comment noted. Any structural damage to the property wall would be covered under the vibration and monitoring plan in the contract specifications to be prepared in the design phase of the project.

Comment PC-P37-16

Maintenance of the buffer of 5 to 6 ft will be done under the same agreement in place. The physical maintenance would be performed, and typical access from the freeway side would be available. Maintenance would be done without large equipment.

Comment PC-P37-17

Construction, especially with drilling or driving piles, would take place during the day as with OCTA's WCC Project in the Seal Beach area. Special provisions would be in place and prepared during the design phase.

Comment PC-P37-18

Construction from Moon Park to Harbor Boulevard is planned early in construction as part of the Stage 1 activities that cover areas beyond the reach from Moon Park to Harbor Boulevard. The total duration is estimated at 18 months. The actual construction for this reach would most likely be less than 18 months based on the scope of work within this location.

Comment PC-P37-19

Please see Common Response – Compensation for Construction Impacts.

Comment PC-P37-20

It is not anticipated that access to your property will be required based on the scope of work required for the freeway widening and wall construction.

Comment PC-P37-21

Air quality Measures AQ-1 through AQ-14, described in Section 3.2.6 of the Draft EIR/EIS, will avoid and/or minimize all construction-related air quality effects. Please see Common Responses – Air Quality and Compensation for Construction Impacts.

Comment PC-P37-22

Please see Response to Comment PC-P37-20.

Comment PC-P37-23

Please see Common Response – Compensation for Construction Impacts.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P38**Comment PC-P38-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

We appreciate your concern. All of the build alternatives include a new entrance ramp from eastbound Ellis Avenue to I-405 southbound. This ramp will reduce the queuing on Ellis Avenue that occurs nearly every morning as described in the comment. Alternatives to the alignment of the new on-ramp from Ellis Avenue were considered during the draft phase. The proposed alignment provides the most advantageous operation, while upholding safety by allowing sufficient storage capacity during ramp metering. The existing soundwall will be moved, but it will still be located within State ROW.

Radiant heat effects are typically not considered for freeway soundwalls. Throughout the I-405 corridor, there are existing and proposed conditions in which soundwalls are or will be placed adjacent to the State ROW. In some instances, there are existing soundwalls within 10 ft of a two-story residence, and they would not likely have any measureable effect on interior or exterior air temperature at 10 ft.

Please see Common Response – Property Values.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P39**Comment PC-P39-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P40

Comment PC-P40-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

This page intentionally left blank.